

Roebuck & Co., is a firm believer in the American system of government and citizen participation in that government by working in the political parties.

He is active in the Sun City Republican Club and has signed up more than 170 members in that organization since the first of the year.

I want to recognize the fine work done by Homer and Myrtle Macy and to share my enthusiasm for their fine work with others.

HEARINGS BEFORE UTILITY RATE HIKES

HON. LEO C. ZEFERETTI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 26, 1976

Mr. ZEFERETTI. Mr. Speaker, in the past several years, utility rates have risen and risen again all across the Nation, striking with particular severity at the elderly, the unemployed and the average working person. In my district, tens of thousands of working families and people on fixed incomes have been hard hit by such price hikes for utility services.

What is particularly unacceptable to me is that often such utility price increases have been processed and put into force without any kind of required public hearings in many jurisdictions around the Nation.

Usually, it is proper procedure for a utility to file a request for price hikes with the appropriate agency, in this case the Federal Power Commission, which possesses authority to pass on these requests when the sales of power are interstate by nature. Public hearings are then scheduled. However, in this process, the Federal Agency seems to almost always grant the price increase as requested and move it along through the proper channels.

The purpose of these public hearings is to discover whether or not the price rise is justified. It is also to allow all parties to make their arguments, pro and con, in a proper forum before any decision is rendered. What is actually happening, then, is a series of events which increasingly are making a mockery out of the concept and intent of the public hearing process. In more than a few cases around the Nation, price hikes have gone into force before hearings have been held. Citizens of various jurisdictions have found themselves in the position of being hit with a higher utility rate without ever having had a chance to protest the company request and take full advantage of legitimate adversary procedures.

Legislation has been introduced to prohibit the Federal Power Commission from granting any rate increases for interstate sale of electricity by generating companies without first holding public hearings. The intent of this bill is to provide all electric utility consumers an opportunity to hear and give testimony before the average consumer is asked or required to pay higher rates. This long overdue piece of legislation has

my support and I am pleased to be able to join in sponsoring it in the House.

It is alarming to note the insensitivity characterizing rate increase procedures in question here. Again and again the price of electricity has gone up without even perfunctory consideration for consumers. Yet, the burden of these costs has grown heavier, almost to an intolerable point in recent months. It is difficult to even pick up and read a national paper without hearing of some utility seeking or obtaining a significant rate increase.

Our people know they cannot cope with this situation. Their utility bills remind them of this truth monthly. Yet, instead of seeking greater consultation and consumer input, the industry, with the aid from the Federal Power Commission, has sought to lessen public input. In this day and age, such a syndrome is both inexcusable and intolerable. People cannot and will not put up with such policies. It is my hope that the Congress, knowing this to be a nationwide problem of serious proportions, will act accordingly and make this legislation a public law.

ANNUAL QUESTIONNAIRE RESULTS

HON. C. W. BILL YOUNG

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 26, 1976

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, last month I mailed questionnaires to residents of the Sixth Congressional District of Florida. This questionnaire contained 13 questions on subjects most often asked of me at appearances in my district. Mr. Speaker, as you can see, in some cases the questions were very specific. In some others, because specifics have not been established the question of necessity was somewhat general, but in either case knowing the general feelings of the people of my district makes me a far more representative Congressman.

These questions represent an excellent sampling of some of the current issues before the Congress and also of importance to the American people. Mr. Speaker, more than 38,000 people responded to my questionnaire with each questionnaire being individually hand-tabulated by volunteers working out of my district office.

I would like to share with my colleagues the responses of my constituents to these questions. The questions and tabulation are as follows:

ANNUAL QUESTIONNAIRE

1. Should the United States relinquish its treaty rights of jurisdiction and control over the Panama Canal Zone?

Yes, 6 percent; no, 90 percent; undecided, 4 percent.

2. Should secret activities of Government agencies like the CIA and FBI be made public?

Yes, 12 percent; no, 86 percent; undecided, 2 percent.

3. Do you agree with those Members of Congress who feel they have the right to reveal classified and top secret national security information?

Yes, 8 percent; no, 90 percent; undecided, 2 percent.

4. In view of the shortage of oil, would you favor an effort to increase the use of coal as an energy producer where possible?

Yes, 89 percent; no, 9 percent; undecided, 2 percent.

5. Do you agree that deficit spending policies of the Federal Government are the major contributors to inflation?

Yes, 85 percent; no, 9 percent; undecided, 6 percent.

6. To fight inflation, would you support substantial reductions in Federal spending programs, even if it meant holding down spending on some popular Government programs?

Yes, 84 percent; no, 12 percent; undecided, 4 percent.

7. Should the United States maintain a position of military superiority in the world?

Yes, 87 percent; no, 11 percent; undecided, 2 percent.

8. Do you support America's foreign aid program?

Yes, 15 percent; no, 80 percent; undecided, 5 percent.

9. Do you believe the Federal Government should assume financial responsibility for cities like New York whose own spending programs have brought on bankruptcy?

Yes, 12 percent; no, 83 percent; undecided, 5 percent.

10. Do you believe there is too much government regulation of business and industry?

Yes, 62 percent; no, 33 percent; undecided, 5 percent.

11. Should Government employees be given the right to strike?

Yes, 12 percent; no, 83 percent; undecided, 5 percent.

12. Would you support pending legislation to prohibit abortions?

Yes, 25 percent; no, 66 percent; undecided, 9 percent.

13. Would you support bills which have been introduced in Congress to prohibit or restrict ownership of hand guns by private citizens?

Yes, 43 percent; no, 53 percent; undecided, 4 percent.

LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE

HON. ALPHONZO BELL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 26, 1976

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, I recommend for the attention of my colleagues the following resolution adopted on the 58th anniversary of Lithuanian independence by the Lithuanian Americans of the Los Angeles area.

The complete text of the resolution follows:

[Lithuanian American Council]

RESOLUTION

We, the Lithuanian Americans of the Greater Los Angeles area, assembled this 15th day of February, 1976 at John Marshall High School, 3939 Tracy Street, Los Angeles, California, to commemorate the restoration of Lithuania's independence, do hereby state as follows:

That February 16, 1976 marks the 58th anniversary of the restoration of independence to the 725 year old Lithuanian State, which was won and protected by the blood sacrifices of the Lithuanian people during the wars of independence of 1919-1920, and recognized by the international community of States; and

E 892

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—Extensions of Remarks February 26, 1976

That the Republic of Lithuania was forcibly occupied and illegally annexed by the Soviet Union in 1940, in violation of all the existing treaties and the principles of international law; and

That subjection of peoples to alien domination and exploitation constitutes a denial of the right to self determination which is one of the fundamental human rights; and

That such an act is contrary to the Charter of the United Nations and to the stipulations of the Helsinki agreement, and is an impediment to the promotion of world peace and cooperation; and

That so many countries under foreign colonial domination have been given the opportunity to establish their own independent states, while Lithuania, having enjoyed the blessings of freedom for centuries, is now subjugated to the most brutal Russian oppression and is nothing but a colony of Soviet empire; and

That through the continuing efforts to change the ethnic character of the population of Lithuania and suppression of religious freedom the Soviet invaders have not been able to suppress the aspirations of the Lithuanian people for freedom and the exercise of their human rights,

Now, therefore, Be it resolved, That we demand that the Soviet Union withdraw its military forces, administrative apparatus and the imported Russian colonists from Lithuania and allow the Lithuanian people to govern themselves freely;

That we demand immediate release of all Lithuanians who are imprisoned for political or religious reasons, and who for years are lingering in various Soviet jails and concentration camps or kept in psychiatric wards;

That in expressing our gratitude to the United States Government for its firm position of non-recognition of the Soviet occupation and annexation of Lithuania, we request an activation of the non-recognition principle by stressing at every opportunity the denial of freedom and national independence to Lithuania and the other Baltic countries;

That the Soviet Union, in seeking a policy of detente with the United States, shall be requested to demonstrate its good faith and good will by restoring freedom and national independence to Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia;

That we are sincerely grateful to the House of Representatives of the United States for passage of a new resolution expressing a sense of the House relating to the status of the Baltic States, and we ask the President and Members of Congress of the United States for their support of the cause of freedom for the Lithuanian nation;

That this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, and copies thereof to the Secretary of State to the United States Senators and Members of the House of Representatives from the State of California, and to the news media.

V. CEKANAUŠKAS,
Chairman.
BR. DUDA,
Secretary.

CHILD AND FAMILY SERVICES ACT

HON. JAMES T. BROYHILL

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 26, 1976

Mr. BROYHILL. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that my colleagues have in recent weeks been deluged with mail from their constituents expressing opposition to H.R. 2966, the Child and Family Services

Act. Much of this mail has been generated by an unsigned flyer circulating throughout the country purporting to outline the purposes and effects of this legislation.

I am opposed to H.R. 2966. I voted against similar legislation in 1971, and I will do so again. It places responsibilities on the Federal Government which I do not believe are the Federal Government's responsibilities. It would make the Federal Government responsible for virtually all the health and nutritional needs of the children involved in the Federal day care program. It would put the Federal Government increasingly into the baby-sitting business.

The potential cost would be virtually unlimited. Indeed, no less an authority than the director of the Congressional Budget Office, Ms. Alice Rivlin, stated in a letter to the Washington Post in 1971 that the funding for such a program could rise to as much as \$10 billion annually.

Certainly, I am aware of the need to provide adequate child care for the children of working mothers. I am aware of the fact that many mothers now on welfare would have some incentive to go to work if they knew their children were receiving proper care and nourishment. However, I do not believe this legislation is the solution to those problems. Certainly, if it is a solution, it is a solution which under present financial circumstances the Federal Government cannot afford to undertake.

If there is a Federal role in assisting working mothers with child care problems; a more constructive alternative to H.R. 2966 would be to allow working parents a tax deduction for child day care as a legitimate business expense. In that way, parents would have the freedom of choice in selecting child care centers plus a financial incentive.

If there are to be standards for child care centers, they should be State standards rather than Federal standards. We have seen to often the hardships created by Federal standards when individual States standards would have been more flexible and dealt with the peculiar needs and problems of individual States.

Yes, I am opposed to H.R. 2966, and I will make every effort to persuade my colleagues to adopt a more rational approach to the problems this bill is supposedly designed to solve. However, I cannot condone efforts by unknown opponents of this legislation to spread false information about the contents and effects of this bill. The unsigned circular alleges that if this bill is passed, parents will not be allowed to require their children to go to Sunday school and church or to take out the garbage. There are no such provisions as these in this bill.

This false and unsigned flyer has alarmed the citizens of my district considerably. Regrettably, they have fallen easy prey to those utter fabrications because their confidence in Government is at an alltime low. This lack of confidence is due in part to the difficult economic times our Nation has experienced, and in part to the fact that so often their Government has promised more than it had the resources to deliver.

In closing, let me repeat that I oppose this bill. Its cost to the already overburdened taxpayer is excessive. It would make Uncle Sam the Nation's baby-sitter. It would allow HEW to exercise control from Washington over standards of local child care services. It is poorly drawn legislation that should be defeated on the basis of facts and not fiction.

I would commend to my colleagues a recent article by Howard Fieger in March 1, 1976 issue of U.S. News & World Report entitled, "False Alarm." It puts in proper perspective the correct current status and true intentions of the Child and Family Services Act. I respectfully insert this excellent article in the Record.

[From U.S. News & World Report, Mar. 1, 1976]

FALSE ALARM

(By Howard Fieger)

Every now and then a reader writes us in words of terror to warn that a Marxist plot is afoot in Congress to "nationalize" our children—take them away from the protection or control of their parents and destroy the American family, utterly and forever.

The volume of mail received here is not a patch on the sacks of it that have been hitting some congressional offices.

The writers are alarmed over what they've been informed is an insidious scheme to give youngsters the legal right to disobey their parents, and thus become pawns of Government—an all-powerful Big Brother to mold their training, conduct and beliefs.

Strange.

It is strange because there isn't a word of truth in it. No such legislation is before this Congress, or ever has been.

The specific bill that has so many people disturbed is "The Child and Family Services Act of 1975." Its authors are Sen. Walter Mondale (Dem.), of Minnesota, and Rep. John Brademas (Dem.), of Indiana. It is "S. 626" in the Senate, "H.R. 2966" in the House. Read it before you panic.

In its present form, the legislation is both innocent and impotent: innocent because it would do none of the things attributed to it; impotent because it isn't going anywhere.

Briefly stated, the proposal is to make federal funds available to help States and communities provide certain public services for children and their families.

These would include such things as prenatal care, food where needed, part or full-time day care for children of working mothers, tutoring at home where deemed useful, medical examination and treatment for certain handicapped children, and training for parents and about-to-be-parents.

There is nothing compulsory about the legislation now before the Congress. Even if the bill were enacted, anyone who felt like it could ignore each and all of its provisions.

Nothing in it says—or implies that youngsters have a legal right to disobey their parents or guardians.

Nowhere does it forbid parental guidance, advice or preference in religious training. The subject isn't mentioned.

In fact, it says in specific words:

"Nothing in this act shall be construed or applied in such manner as to infringe upon or usurp the moral and legal rights and responsibilities of parents."

So why all the excitement? It is puzzling to Senator Mondale, one of the chief sponsors, who says the measure "is being subjected to one of the most distorted and dishonest attacks I have witnessed in my 15 years of public service."

There is another practical thing to keep in mind about The Child and Family Service